

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-6, 12, and 13 are pending.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 based on Latif et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6, 400,730).

Claims 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Latif and Lent et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,260,737).

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Latif and Thompson (U. S. Pat. No. 6,895,461).

Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 in view of Latif, Thompson, and Lent.

IDS Submissions

The examiner did not have a chance to consider IDSs filed October 1, 2007 and December 7, 2007. Each IDS was filed in connection with actions in corresponding foreign applications. Consideration of the references cited in these IDSs is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Without conceding the merits of the rejections, claims 7-11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 12 and 13 have been appended. Example of embodiments of claims 12 and 13 are shown in Figs. 1, 3, and 4. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claim 1

The examiner correctly noted that the Latif reference does not teach the storage device and management terminal in his Section 103 rejection of claim 1. The examiner cited Thompson for allegedly supplying the limitations not taught by Latif. Respectfully, however, the examiner is believed to be in error for the reasons set forth below.

1. “storage device comprising ... security management table” is not taught

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

... a storage device comprising a plurality of storage areas and a storage section storing a security management table for registering information about access enable/disable to each of the plurality of storage areas from the information processing device ... (emphasis added)

See also independent claim 12. Fig. 1 in the instant application shows a storage device 30 which “includes a controller 39 and a plurality of disks 31.” *Specification as originally filed, page 9, lines 14-16*. The examiner noted that Latif does not teach the recited storage device.

Thompson shows storage 140 (Figs. 1 and 5 for example) connected in a storage network 139. *Col. 4, lines 1-3*. Figs. 1 and 5 further show a storage router 110, the details of which are shown in Fig. 5. The examiner identified the access list 322 in the storage router 110 as teaching the “security management table.”

However, as shown in Applicant’s Fig. 1 and recited in amended claim 1, the storage device comprises the security management table. Thompson, on the other hand, shows the access list 322 in the storage router 110. The storage router clearly is a component separately delineated from the storage network 139 and the storage 140. Thus, to the extent that Thompson’s access list 322 corresponds to the recited security management table, Thompson does not teach “a storage device comprising a plurality of storage areas and a storage section storing a security management table for registering information about access enable/disable to each of the plurality of storage areas from the information processing device,” because the Thompson’s access list 322 is not in the storage 140.

Since Latif does not teach this limitation and Thompson also does not teach this limitation, the combination likewise does not teach “a storage device comprising a plurality of storage areas and a storage section storing a security management table for registering information about access enable/disable to each of the plurality of storage areas from the information processing device.” For at least this reason, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

2. “network converter” is not taught

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

... a network converter connected to the information processing device and the storage device so as to be communicable [comprising] a first protocol conversion section [to convert 1st protocol to 2nd protocol and] a second protocol conversion section [to convert 2nd protocol to 1st protocol] ...

See also independent claim 12. The Office action noted that Latif does not teach the recited network converter.

The examiner cited column 6, lines 34-42 in Thompson for allegedly teaching this limitation. A review of this cited portion reveals a discussion about “converting” an iSCSI address to a physical address, “SCSI router 105 includes one or more instances 114, one for each iSCSI target 310-311. Each instance 114 uses the respective mapping 318 to convert the iSCSI address to the physical address used to access a particular LUN 141-142.”

It is earnestly submitted that neither an iSCSI address nor a physical address constitute a first protocol or a second protocol; they are simply addresses. Thompson therefore does not teach the recited “network converter [comprising] a first protocol conversion section ... a second protocol conversion section.”

Since Latif does not teach this limitation and Thompson also does not teach this limitation, then the combination likewise does not teach “a network converter connected to the information processing device and the storage device so as to be communicable [comprising] a first protocol conversion section [to convert 1st protocol to 2nd protocol and] a second protocol conversion section [to convert 2nd protocol to 1st protocol]” For at least this reason, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

3. “management terminal” is not taught

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part:

... a management terminal connected to the storage device and the network converter so as to be communicable ...

See also independent claim 12. The Office action noted that Latif does not teach the recited management terminal.

The examiner cited Thompson's management station 210 (Fig. 12) for allegedly teaching the recited management terminal. To the extent that Thompson's storage 140 was cited as corresponding to the recited storage device, Thompson's management terminal 210 clearly is not "connected to" the storage 140, and as best understood is connected only to the storage routers 110 via network 159, "A management station 210 manages the storage routers 110 through an IP network 159 connected to the management interface 158 and/or 168 of each storage router." *Col. 15, lines 1-4.*

Since Latif does not teach this limitation and Thompson also does not teach this limitation, then the combination likewise does not teach "a management terminal connected to the storage device and the network converter so as to be communicable." (emphasis added). For at least this reason, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 is believed to be overcome.

To further distinguish over Thompson, claim 1 has been amended to further recite:

... wherein the management terminal notifies the storage device of information about correspondence between the identification number of each of the plurality of storage areas and the second identification number of the information processing device for which access is enabled to the storage area ... (emphasis added)

See similarly recited limitation in claim 12.

Thompson clearly does not mention any communication between his management station 210 and storage 140 (identified as corresponding to the recited storage device). Thompson does not teach this added limitation.

For any of the reasons set forth above, the Section 103 rejections of claims 1-6 are believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/817,032
Amdt. dated January 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of October 9, 2007

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/George B. F. Yee/

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY
61250430 v1